REMARKS

Upon entry of this Reply, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, 18, 20, and 22 will remain in this application. Claims 3, 6-15, 17, 19, 21, and 23-55 were previously canceled. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

The material referred to in section 1 on page 2 of the Office Action is not "essential" material as defined by MPEP 608.01(p) and is no longer incorporated by reference into the specification of the present application.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,249,661 to Kawamura et al. Dependent claims 2, 4, 5, 16, 18, 20, and 22 were also rejected based on the Kawamura et al. ('661) patent. Reconsideration is requested, since the claims presently in this application distinguish the invention from the synchronizer ring forming the subject matter of the Kawamura et al. ('661) patent.

The Kawamura et al. ('661) patent does not disclose a synchronizer ring comprising a tribological coating containing a maximum of 40% by weight of a solid lubricant as claim 1 of this application presently requires. The film 3 of the Kawamura et al. ('661) synchronizer ring has ceramic particles of 5 to 30% by weight disposed in molybdenum or a molybdenum alloy. Lines 30-35 in column 4 of the Kawamura et al. ('661) patent explicitly set forth that when the ceramic particles

are present in an amount over 30 weight %, abrasion of the object member may overexceed. The Kawamura et al. ('661) patent, therefore, discloses a synchronizer ring with a film containing a maximum of 30% by weight of ceramic particles and not a maximum of approximately 40% by weight of a solid lubricant as claim 1 defines.

The Kawamura et al. ('661) patent also does not disclose a synchronizer ring comprising a tribological coating in which a solid lubricant has a particle size of no more than approximately 180 μm as claim 1 of this application presently requires. The portion of the Kawamura et al. ('661) patent specification appearing in lines 19-28 in column 5 sets forth that the film 3 has a thickness of 70 to 200 μm but fails to specify any solid lubricant particle size whatsoever. One of ordinary skill in the art would be able to infer a solid lubricant particle size from the Kawamura et al. ('661) disclosure only if that individual is presented with the presently claimed invention.

For reasons set forth above, claim 1 is not anticipated by the Kawamura et al. ('661) patent relied on, and it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable in its present form. The rest of the claims in this application depend on claim 1 and are patentable as well.

This application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions after considering this Reply, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 9, 2003

Richard R. Diefendorf
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING, LLP
P.O. BOX 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 628-8800
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
RRD:msy

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

In the paragraph appearing below, deletions are bracketed. There are no additions.

--**[0001]** This application claims the priority of German application 100 17 285.7, filed April 6, 2000[, the disclosure of which is expressly incorporated by reference herein].--